



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,084	01/08/2001	James H. Waldo	06502.0110-01	6895

60667 7590 03/05/2007  
SUN MICROSYSTEMS/FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP  
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
----------

AILES, BENJAMIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/05/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/755,084	Applicant(s) WALDO ET AL.	
	Examiner Benjamin A. Ailes	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-24 and 26-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-21, 23, 24 and 30-39 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11, 22, 26-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                            |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the request for reconsideration filed 12 February 2007, the finality of the last office action is hereby withdrawn and prosecution is reopened.
2. Claims 8-24 and 26-39 remain pending. Claims 12-21, 23-24 and 30-39 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 8-11, 22 and 26-29 have been examined.
3. If possible, the applicant should update status of the related applications cited throughout the specification.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8-11, 22 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunnell (US 6,119,122) in view of Sumsion et al. (US 6,496,865 B1), hereinafter referred to as Sumsion.

6. Regarding claims 8, 22 and 26, Bunnell teaches a method in a data processing system having a lookup service with associated services available for use in the data processing system, comprising the steps of:

maintaining a lookup service (col. 2, ll. 51-65, user can modify attributes);

receiving a request to update the lookup service (Figure 3, item 51, 52 and col. 8,

ll. 20-25, user selects an object in directory to update);

updating the lookup service such that the associated services unaffected by the update continue to be available for use while the update occurs (figure 3, itme 52, col. 8, ll. 20-26, user selects and modifies a target object independently from the directory).

Bunnell teaches the implementation of a management service that can be maintained by individual users and the management service including objects that have associated attributes having associated values (col. 1, ll. 41-47) but does not explicitly recite the management service including a service item containing at least a stub or a serialized object for use in accessing at least one of the services. However, in related art, Sumsion teaches a system and method for implementing a resource access system utilizing a stub for performing functions related to servicing a client to be given access to a server resource (col. 9, ll. 16-32). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize in combination with the management service provided by Bunnell functioning as a network lookup service a method for servicing a client by performing resource access utilizing a stub. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination for the reasons stated above and further to advance the ability for client to access server resources in a faster and more cost efficient manner (Sumsion, col. 3, ll. 58-64).

7. Regarding claim 9, Bunnell and Sumsion teach the updating step including associating a new service with the lookup service (Bunnell, col. 14, ll. 24-28, create new object.).

8. Regarding claim 10, Bunnell and Sumsion teach the method wherein the updating step includes disassociating one of the associated services from the lookup

Art Unit: 2142

service so that the one service is no longer available to use (Bunnell, col. 14, ll. 24-28, delete object).

9. Regarding claim 11, Bunnell and Sumsion teach the method wherein the associated service have attributes and wherein the updating step includes the step of modifying the attributes of one of the associated services (Bunnell, col. 14, ll. 24-28, change object properties).

10. Claim 27 contains similar subject matter and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9.

11. Claim 28 contains similar subject matter and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10.

12. Claim 29 contains similar subject matter and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11.

### ***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-11, 22 and 26-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bodine et al. (US 5,987,471) teaches a sub-foldering system in a direct-service-based launcher.

Tietjen et al. (US 5,983,234) teaches a method and apparatus for generically viewing and editing objects.

Ferguson et al. (US 6,061,740) teaches a method and apparatus for heterogeneous network management.

Cook et al. (US 6,061,726) teaches a dynamic rights assignment apparatus and method using network directory services.

Franklin et al. (US 6,105,069) teaches a licensing controller using network directory services.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4, IFP Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

baa

*Beatriz Prieto*  
BEATRIZ PRIETO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER